



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,774	01/16/2004	Philip Barthram	063170.6682	8142
5073	7590	11/15/2007		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER QIAN, SONGWEI	
			ART UNIT 2191	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,774

Applicant(s)

BARTHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Songwei Qian

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2007 and 21 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87, 89 and 90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87, 89 and 90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-90 are pending in this application (10/759,774).
2. Claim 88 is cancelled by applicant on July 10, 2007.
3. Claims 1, 22-23, 36, 44-45, and 66-87 are amended by applicant on July 10, 2007.
4. Claim 89 is added by applicant on July 10, 2007.
5. Claims 1, 23, 45, and 67 are amended on September 21, 2007.
6. Claim 90 is added by applicant on September 21, 2007.
7. Claims 1-87 and 89-90 are presented for examination.
8. All the references used by examiner in this office action were cited in examiner's previous office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1, 23, 45, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

Art Unit: 2191

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following limitation was added by Applicants on September 21, 2007 without any written description support in the original specification.

displaying, to a network administrator, a user-object data structure comprising resource information identifying all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users.

The closest information disclosed in the original specification is

at least one of the plurality of computers is associated with a user having a user characteristic (the second paragraph of Page 3); or

inputting selection information including one of the user characteristic and a computer characteristic into a selected computer (the third paragraph of Page 3).

11. Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following limitation was added by Applicants on September 21, 2007 without any written description support in the original specification.

displaying, to a network administrator resource information identifying a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user.

The closest information disclosed in the original specification is

at least one of the plurality of computers is associated with a user having a user characteristic (the second paragraph of Page 3); or

inputting selection information including one of the user characteristic and a computer characteristic into a selected computer (the third paragraph of Page 3).

12. Claims 1, 23, 45, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a special case illustrated in FIG. 3B, does not reasonably provide enablement for displaying, to a network administrator, a user-object data structure comprising resource information identifying all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. For example, a user can only access two computers in two separate networks in an organization. Two separate networks are managed by two different administrators. So each administrator can only see one computer in the network he administers, and cannot see another one. Therefore, the administrator cannot see "all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by the user". Also, for a domain user, the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for how to identify all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users.

13. Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a special case illustrated in FIG. 3B, does not reasonably provide enablement for displaying, to a network administrator resource information identifying a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. For example, a user can only access two computers in two separate networks in an organization. Two separate networks are managed by two different administrators. So each administrator can only see one computer in the network he administers, and cannot see another one. Therefore, an administrator cannot see "a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user". Also, for a domain user, the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for how to identify a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2191

15. Claims 1-13, 23-35, 45-57, 67-79, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronberg et al. (US Pat. #: 5,933,647), hereinafter "Aronberg", in view of Okada et al. (US Pat. #: 6,049,670), hereinafter "Okada".

16. As for claim 1, Aronberg discloses:

A method (Col. 11, Lines 1-3) for managing a plurality of computers, at least one of the plurality of computers associated with a user having a user characteristic, comprising:

displaying, to a network administrator, a user-object data structure comprising resource information identifying computer-related information (FIGs. 7-10);

receiving selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) from a network administrator (the user at the administrator, Col. 4, lines 62-67 and Col. 2, lines 54-57), the selection information comprising a user characteristic associated with the selected user (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9);

receiving management information (distribution control information, Col. 2, lines 54-57, Col. 2, line 66 to Col. 3, line 1 and Col. 3, lines 8-14) from the network administrator (the user at the administrator, Col. 4, lines 62-67 and Col. 2, lines 54-57);

selecting at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) based on selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 3, lines 8-14, Col. 4, lines 48-67, and FIGs. 3-10); and

Art Unit: 2191

modifying the at least one selected computer based on the management information (Col. 3, lines 8-14 and FIGs. 3-10).

However, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:

computer-related information is all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users.

On the other hand, Okada discloses:

computer-related information is all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users (FIGs. 2-6, Col. 6, lines 25-33 and Col. 7, lines 30-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Okada by having computer-related information is all network computers within a plurality of network computers that are used by a selected one of a plurality of users in order to allow distributions based on any combination of several criteria, including user name, group membership, hard disk size, free disk space, and environment variables (Aronberg, Col. 2, Lines 1-7), to provide a complete software distribution and desktop management system for a computer network environment, and to provide a software distribution and desktop management system with full integration into a graphical user interface based operating system (Aronberg, Col. 1, Lines 30-31 and Col. 2, lines 43-49).



17. As for claims 23, 45, and 67, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

18. As for claim 90, Aronberg discloses:

A method, comprising:

displaying, to a network administrator resource information identifying computer-related information (FIGs. 7-10);

receiving selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) from the network administrator (the user at the administrator, Col. 4, lines 62-67 and Col. 2, lines 54-57), the selection information comprising a user characteristic associated with the user (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9);

receiving management information (distribution control information, Col. 2, lines 54-57, Col. 2, line 66 to Col. 3, line 1 and Col. 3, lines 8-14) from the network administrator (the user at the administrator, Col. 4, lines 62-67 and Col. 2, lines 54-57); based on the selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 3, lines 8-14, Col. 4, lines 48-67, and FIGs. 3-10), selecting the plurality of network computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-14); and

modifying the selected plurality of network computers based on the management information (Col. 3, lines 8-14 and FIGs. 3-10).

Art Unit: 2191

However, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:

computer-related information is a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user; and

the plurality of network computers are associated with the user.

On the other hand, Okada discloses:

computer-related information is a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user (FIGs. 2-6, Col. 6, lines 25-33 and Col. 7, lines 30-31); and

the plurality of network computers are associated with the user (FIGs. 2-6, Col. 6, lines 25-33 and Col. 7, lines 30-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Okada by having computer-related information to be a plurality of network computers that are used by a single user and the plurality of network computers that are associated with the user in order to allow distributions based on any combination of several criteria, including user name, group membership, hard disk size, free disk space, and environment variables (Aronberg, Col. 2, Lines 1-7), to provide a complete software distribution and desktop management system for a computer network environment, and to provide a software distribution and desktop management system with full integration into a graphical user interface based operating system (Aronberg, Col. 1, Lines 30-31 and Col. 2, lines 43-49).

19. As for claims 2, 24, 46, and 68, Aronberg discloses:

selecting includes identifying at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) associated with the user having the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9).

20. As for claims 3, 25, 47, and 69, Aronberg discloses:

the selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) further includes a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14), and selecting includes identifying at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) having the computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14)

21. As for claims 4, 26, 48, and 70, Aronberg discloses:

the selection information further includes a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14), and selecting includes identifying at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) having the computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14) and the at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) is associated with the user having the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9).

22. As for claims 5, 27, 49, and 71, Aronberg discloses:

selecting and modifying are performed when the user becomes newly associated with at least one of the plurality of computers (Col. 4, lines 62-67, Col. 3, lines 8-14, Col. 1, lines 41-45, and FIGs. 3-10; note that “the user at the administrator” selects which user associated with which computer should have a software).

23. As for claims 6, 28, 50, and 72, Aronberg discloses:

selecting and modifying are performed when the user characteristic is one of changed and added (Col. 4, lines 62-67, Col. 3, lines 8-14, Col. 1, lines 41-45, and FIGs. 3-10; note that “the user at the administrator” selects which user associated with which computer should have a software).

24. As for claims 7, 29, 51, and 73, Aronberg discloses:

the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9) is related to an employment function of the user (marketing group users, financial group users, engineering group users, Col. 5, lines 60-65).

25. As for claims 8, 30, 52, and 74, Aronberg discloses:

the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9) is at least one of a user group and a geographic identifier (marketing group users, financial group users, engineering group users, Col. 5, lines 60-65).

26. As for claims 9, 31, 53, and 75, Aronberg discloses:

the selection information further includes a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14), and the computer characteristic is related to a function of at least one of the plurality of computers (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10).

27. As for claims 10, 32, 54, and 76, Aronberg discloses:

the selection information further includes a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14), and the computer characteristic is at least one of a group (group of workstations, Col. 1, lines 40-44), a geographic identifier, and configuration information (customized configuration, Col. 2, lines 52-57 and Col. 1, lines 40-44).

28. As for claims 11, 33, 55, and 77, Aronberg discloses:

modifying includes transmitting software to the at least one selected computer (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) from a software database (the file server, Col. 3, lines 8-14 and Col. 6, lines 20-23), and installing the software on the at least one selected computer (Col. 3, lines 8-14).

29. As for claims 12, 34, 56, and 78, Aronberg discloses:

Art Unit: 2191

the management information (distribution control information, Col. 2, lines 54-57, Col. 2, line 66 to Col. 3, line 1 and Col. 3, lines 8-14) includes a software identifier (the software, Col. 3, line 10 and FIG. 5) and an action (FIG. 5) to be performed on the at least one selected computer (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10).

30. As for claims 13, 35, 57, and 79, Aronberg discloses:

displaying the management information associated with the user (FIG. 3-6 and FIG. 9-10), wherein the management information includes at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14), at least one installation (the software, Col. 3, line 10 and FIG. 5) associated with the user (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9), and at least one task (FIG. 5) associated with the user (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9);

31. Claims 22, 44, 66, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronberg in view of Davis et al. (US Pat. #: 5,742,829), hereinafter "Davis".

32. As for claim 22, Aronberg discloses:

A method (Col. 11, Lines 1-3) for managing a plurality of computers, at least one of the plurality of computers associated with a user having a user characteristic, comprising:

receiving selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2,

Art Unit: 2191

lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) including one of the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9) and a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14) from one of the plurality of computers (workstation running the console, ABSTRACT, lines 4-10 and Col. 4, lines 62-67);

transmitting the selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) to a managing computer (workstation running the console and a file server, ABSTRACT, lines 4-10, Col. 4, lines 49-50, and Col. 4, lines 62-67);

searching in a database (Col. 4, lines 49-61) for the selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) to identify management information (distribution control information, Col. 2, lines 54-57, Col. 2, line 66 to Col. 3, line 1 and Col. 3, lines 8-14) associated with the selection information, the management information comprising a policy (a profile, Col. 2, line 67 and Col. 4, lines 48-54) applicable to a particular user (user name, Col. 2, lines 1-7 and FIGs. 6 and 9); and

modifying a computer used by the user based on the policy applicable to the user (Col. 4, lines 49-61 and Col. 3, lines 8-14).

However, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:

modifying the computer from which the selection information was received.

Art Unit: 2191

On the other hand, Davis discloses:

modifying the computer from which the selection information was received  
(Col. 8, line 62 to Col. 9, line 14 and Col. 12, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Davis by modifying the computer from which the selection information was received in order to allow distributions based on any combination of several criteria, including user name, group membership, hard disk size, free disk space, and environment variables (Aronberg, Col. 2, Lines 1-7), to provide a complete software distribution and desktop management system for a computer network environment, and to provide a software distribution and desktop management system with full integration into a graphical user interface based operating system (Aronberg, Col. 1, Lines 30-31 and Col. 2, lines 43-49).

33. As for claims 44 and 66, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the rejection of claim 22.

34. As for claim 89, Aronberg discloses:

A system for managing a plurality of computers (Col. 9, lines 47-48), comprising:  
a network computer comprising a central processing unit (workstation running the console, ABSTRACT, lines 4-10, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 1-2) operable to:



Art Unit: 2191

receive selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) from a network user (the user at the administrator, Col. 4, lines 62-67 and Col. 2, lines 54-57), the selection information comprising at least one of a user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9) and a computer characteristic (User [machine id], FIG. 9, Col. 2, lines 3-7, and Col. 3, lines 8-14); and

transmit the selection information (Col. 4, lines 49-50, and Col. 4, lines 62-67);

a managing computer coupled to the network computer by a network, the managing computer comprising a central processing unit (workstation running the console and a file server, ABSTRACT, lines 4-10, Col. 4, lines 49-50, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs 1-2) operable to:

receive the selection information transmitted by the network computer (Col. 4, lines 49-50, and Col. 4, lines 62-67);

search in a database (Col. 4, lines 49-61) for the selection information (any combination of several criteria, Col. 2, lines 3-5, Col. 4, lines 62-67, and FIGs. 3-10) to identify management information (distribution control information, Col. 2, lines 54-57, Col. 2, line 66 to Col. 3, line 1 and Col. 3, lines 8-14) associated with the selection information, the management information comprising a policy (a profile, Col. 2, line 67 and Col. 4, lines 48-54) applicable to a particular user (user name, Col. 2, lines 1-7 and FIGs. 6 and 9); and

Art Unit: 2191

modifying a computer used by the user based on the policy applicable to the user (Col. 4, lines 49-61 and Col. 3, lines 8-14).

However, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:

modifying the computer from which the selection information was received.

On the other hand, Davis discloses:

modifying the computer from which the selection information was received (Col. 8, line 62 to Col. 9, line 14 and Col. 12, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Davis by modifying the computer from which the selection information was received in order to allow distributions based on any combination of several criteria, including user name, group membership, hard disk size, free disk space, and environment variables (Aronberg, Col. 2, Lines 1-7), to provide a complete software distribution and desktop management system for a computer network environment, and to provide a software distribution and desktop management system with full integration into a graphical user interface based operating system (Aronberg, Col. 1, Lines 30-31 and Col. 2, lines 43-49).

Art Unit: 2191

35. Claims 16, 21, 38, 43, 60, 65, 82, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronberg in view of Okada, and further in view of Davis et al. (US Pat. #: 5,742,829), hereinafter "Davis".

36. As for claims 16, 38, 60, and 82, Aronberg discloses:

modifying a computer (which computer, Col. 3, lines 8-10) based on the user characteristic (user name, Col. 2, line 3 and FIGs. 6 and 9) that is one of stored in a database (the file server, Col. 3, lines 8-14 and Col. 6, lines 20-23).

However, both Aronberg and Okada do not explicitly disclose:

modifying a computer based on the user characteristic that is one of stored in a database and entered into the at least one selected computer by the user.

On the other hand, Davis discloses:

modifying a computer based on the user characteristic (the current user and user configuration information for the current user, Col. 12, Lines 40-41) that is one of stored in a database (SQL Server, FIG. 2) and entered into the at least one selected computer by the user (FIG. 4, FIG. 5A, and FIG. 5B, and the client setup executable 354 accesses the domain initialization file 356 to retrieve the program list ("the program list") to be loaded onto the client and utilizes the copy list 358 to load the software, Col. 9, Lines 8-11; note that "the client" here means "the local computer" with user characteristic).

Art Unit: 2191

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Davis by modifying a computer based on the user characteristic that is one of stored in a database and entered into the at least one selected computer by the user in order to install software from a master computer to a slave computer upon user initiation (Davis, Col. 1, lines 66-67).

37. As for claims 21, 43, 65, and 87, both Aronberg and Okada do not explicitly disclose:

checking newly inputted management information against the management information for a conflict.

However, Davis discloses:

checking newly inputted management information against the management information for a conflict (if the program list differs from what is actually installed on a client, during the process of logging onto the client server, the preferred embodiment will make what is actually loaded on the client conform to the program list, Col. 9, Lines 21-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg with the teachings of Davis by

Art Unit: 2191

checking newly inputted management information against the management information for a conflict in order to give the user total control over what events will take place (Aronberg, Col. 1, Lines 30-31).

38. Claims 14-15, 17-19, 36-37, 39-41, 58-59, 61-63, 80-81, and 83-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronberg in view of Okada, and further in view of Lubanski et al. (Mike Lubanski and Darshan Doshi, "SMS 2 Administration", SAMS, February 2000), hereinafter "Lubanski".

39. As for claims 14, 36, 58, and 80, both Aronberg and Okada do not explicitly disclose:

displaying information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user.

However, Lubanski discloses:

displaying information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user (browse the hardware and software inventory of a machine and the product-compliance details of software on machines, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 12 of 14, Lines 21-22).

Art Unit: 2191

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Lubanski by displaying information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user in order to distribute and manage software as well as to track the software's usage (Lubanski, Chapter 1, Section: The Need for Desktop and Software Management, Page 3 of 4, Lines 34-35).

40. As for claims 15, 37, 59, and 81, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:  
providing a link to information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user.

However, Lubanski discloses:

providing a link to information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user (Resource Explorer is used to browse the hardware and software inventory of a machine and the product-compliance details of software on machines, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 12 of 14, Line 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Lubanski by providing a link to information stored on at least one of the plurality of computers associated with the user in order to distribute and manage software as well as to track

Art Unit: 2191

the software's usage (Lubanski, Chapter 1, Section: The Need for Desktop and Software Management, Page 3 of 4, Lines 34-35).

41. As for claims 17, 39, 61, and 83, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:  
storing at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic in an external database.

However, Lubanski discloses:

storing at least one of a computer characteristic (Resource Domain, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Pages 2-3 of 14, Figure 2.2) and the user characteristic (Account Domain, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Pages 2-3 of 14, Figure 2.2) in an external database (SQL database) (SMS uses the SQL database as an engine and storage facility for its data, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14, Line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Lubanski by storing at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic in an external database in order to provide the information necessary for SMS to perform its other functions, such as software distribution or remote control (Lubanski, Chapter 2,

Art Unit: 2191

Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14,  
Lines 9-10)

42. As for claims 18, 40, 62, and 84, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:  
interfacing with an external database including at least one of a computer  
characteristic and the user characteristic.

However, Lubanski discloses:

interfacing with an external database including at least one of a computer  
characteristic (Resource Domain, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of  
Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Pages 2-3 of 14, Figure 2.2) and the user characteristic  
(Account Domain, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT,  
SQL, and SMS, Pages 2-3 of 14, Figure 2.2) (SMS uses the SQL database as an  
engine and storage facility for its data, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts  
of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14, Line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was  
made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Lubanski  
by interfacing with an external database including at least one of a computer  
characteristic and the user characteristic in order to provide the information necessary  
for SMS to perform its other functions, such as software distribution or remote control



Art Unit: 2191

(Lubanski, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14, Lines 9-10).

43. As for claims 19, 41, 63, and 85, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:  
populating an external database including at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic with application data.

However, Lubanski discloses:

populating an external database (SQL database) including at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic with application data (Chapter 8, Section: Discovery and Discovery Methods, Page 1 of 16, Lines 17-18, and Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 12 of 14 , Lines 1-5) (Note that SMS uses the SQL database as an engine and storage facility for its data, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14, Line 6; all discovered resources are stored in SQL database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Lubanski by populating an external database including at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic with application data in order to provide the information necessary for SMS to perform its other functions, such as software distribution or

Art Unit: 2191

remote control (Lubanski, Chapter 2, Section: Explanation of Key Concepts of Windows NT, SQL, and SMS, Page 5 of 14, Lines 9-10).

44. Claims 20, 42, 64, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aronberg in view of Okada, and further in view of Brovick et al. (Edgar Brovick, Doug Hauger, and William C. Wade III, "Windows 2000 Active Directory", SAMS, February 2000), hereinafter "Brovick".

45. As for claims 20, 42, 64, and 86, Aronberg does not explicitly disclose:  
populating a target database with data from an external database, the data including at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic.

However, Brovick discloses:

populating a target database (DC) with data from an external database (DC) (replicate the directory data between the DCs, Chapter 10, Section: Replication, Page 1 of 8, Line 12), the data including at least one of a computer characteristic and the user characteristic (critical information about computer networks, users, and groups in a single data store, Chapter 2, Page 1 of 9, Line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Aronberg and Okada with the teachings of Brovick by

populating a target database with data from an external database in order to provide quick and efficient directory services to clients across the enterprise (Brovick, Chapter 10, Section: Replication, Page 1 of 8, Line 9).

### ***Response to Arguments***

46. Regarding applicant's Remark I (filed on July 10, 2007) with respect to 101 rejection, the amendments to claims 67-88 are accepted by the examiner as overcoming the previous 101 rejection.

47. Regarding applicant's Remark II (filed on July 10, 2007) with respect to 112 rejection, the amendments to claims 67-88 are accepted by the examiner as overcoming the previous 112 rejection.

48. Applicant's arguments (filed on July 10, 2007) with respect to claims 1-87 and 89 (Remarks III and IV) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

49. Regarding applicant's Remark I (B) (filed on September 21, 2007) with respect to the 102 rejection (the last paragraph of Page 23), examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument that Aronberg does not teach "transmitting the selection information to a managing computer". Note that "File Server" disclosed in FIG. 1 by Aronberg is a manager server which contains a database containing all profiles (Col. 4, lines 15-26 and 48-50). From FIG. 1, Aronberg clearly teaches that the selection

Art Unit: 2191

information has to be transmitted from "WORKSTATION RUNNING CONSOLE" to "FILE SERVER" before it can be transmitted to an end user's computer.

50. Regarding applicant's Remark I (B) (filed on September 21, 2007) with respect to the 102 rejection (the first paragraph of Page 24), examiner agrees with applicant's argument that Aronberg does not teach that the modified computer is "the computer from which the selection information was received". Therefore, the final rejection filed on August 15, 2007 is withdrawn here.

51. Applicant's other arguments (filed on September 21, 2007) with respect to the 102 rejections have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

52. Applicant's amendment filed on July 10, 2007 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

53. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Songwei Qian whose telephone number is 571-270-1910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (alternative Friday off 8:00am thru 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SQ 11/02/2007

MARY STEELMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

